

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 2-13 are pending in the application.

The applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority and receipt of certified copies of all the priority document(s), and for determining that the drawings are acceptable.

The Office action rejects claims 2-3 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Feierbach (USP 7,107,471). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

"A rejection under U.S.C. 102(b) is proper only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim." **MPEP 2131**. "There must be no difference between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure, as viewed by a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention." **BPAI Opinion No. 2005-2289, October 2005**.

Feierbach fails to teach a power saving circuit that selects a subset of functional units and/or parts of memory to switch to a power-saving state based on an instruction address associated with the instruction word that is output from an instruction memory system, as specifically claimed in claim 6, upon which each of claims 2-4 and 7-10 depend.

The Office action cites column 6, lines 23-58 of Feierbach for providing this teaching. The applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion. At the cited text, Feierbach specifically teaches:

"In the processor architecture 300, the instructions are very long instruction words that are stored in an instruction memory unit 308, for example a cache memory device, from which instructions are loaded into an instruction register 310. The instruction register 310 is divided into multiple slots 312, each of which contains a portion of a Very Long Instruction Word (VLIW). Each slot 312 directs its portion of the VLIW to control one or more functional units 302 in the architecture 300. In this specific embodiment, each slot 312 controls a single functional unit 302." (Feierbach, column 6, lines 23-33.)

As is clearly evident from the cited text, Feierbach's control of each function unit is based on the instruction at the corresponding 'slot' in the instruction register. If a "sleep" instruction is loaded from the instruction memory unit 308 into the instruction register 310, Feierbach's device will place the functional unit associated with the slot in which the sleep instruction is placed into a power-saving state, independent of the address of the instruction in the instruction memory unit 308. Feierbach does not teach or suggest that placing a function unit into a power-saving state is dependent upon the instruction address associated with the instruction word.

Because Feierbach fails to teach a power saving circuit that selects a subset of functional units and/or parts of memory to switch to a power-saving state based on an instruction address associated with the instruction word that is output from an instruction memory system, as specifically claimed in claim 6, the applicants respectfully maintain that the rejection of claims 2-3 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Feierbach is unfounded under MPEP 2131, and should be reversed.

The Office action rejects claims 4 and 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Feierbach and Bartley (USP 6,219,796). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Each of claims 4 and 7-9 are dependent upon claim 6, and in this rejection, the Examiner relies upon Feierbach for teaching the elements of claim 6. As noted above, Feierbach fails to teach or suggest each of the elements of claim 6. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully maintain that the rejection of claims 4 and 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) that relies on Feierbach for teaching the elements of claim 6 should be withdrawn.

The Office action rejects claims 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Bartley. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Office action acknowledges that Bartley fails to teach a functional unit that receives a power saving instruction and controls a power saving circuit to switch at least one other functional unit to a power saving state based on the power saving instruction, as specifically claimed in claim 11, upon which claims 12 and 13 depend.

The Office action asserts that this teaching would have been "an obvious matter of design choice" because the applicants have not disclosed that this feature provides an advantage, is used to a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. The applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion. Receiving a power saving instruction and controlling a power saving circuit to switch another function unit to a power saving state, as claimed, demonstrates that the function unit is being "used to a particular purpose". The applicants also note that an advantage provided by this novel configuration is that each functional unit does not have to be configured to be able to execute a 'sleep' command, as specifically taught by Bartley.

The Office action also asserts that one of skill in the art "would have expected the applicant's invention to perform equally well with either the claimed functional unit or other unit as taught by Bartley to receive a power saving instruction because both units perform the same function". The applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion. Bartley's unit does not "perform the same function" as the applicants' claimed function of controlling another functional unit. Bartley's teachings require each of the functional units to be able to recognize and execute a 'sleep' command.

Because Bartley fails to teach or suggest the claimed functional unit that receives a power saving instruction and controls a power saving circuit to switch at least one other functional unit to a power saving state based on the power saving instruction, and because this claimed capability is advantageously used to a particular purpose, the applicants respectfully maintain that the rejection of claims 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is unfounded, and should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert M. McDermott/
Robert M. McDermott, Esq.
Reg. 41,508
804-493-0707

Please direct all correspondence to:
Corporate Counsel
U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001